

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,892,441 to Woolley et al. ("*Woolley*"). By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-4 to more particularly define the scope of the invention. Claims 1-12 remain pending and under current examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-12 as allegedly anticipated by *Woolley*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites a vehicle-mounted apparatus comprising, among other things, a "map data reading means" for reading "the map data corresponding to the location information". *Woolley* fails to teach or suggest at least this element of claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that "the location information measurement unit is met by the GPS sensor" in *Woolley*. Even assuming this is true, *Woolley* does not disclose reading maps from storage that correspond to the location information from the GPS. Instead, the GPS in *Woolley* is used only to generate information about the route a given item is supposed to take, and to inform the user of deviations from that route. (*Woolley* at col. 55, lines 44-51). A route merely describes one set of directions for getting to a particular location. A map, on the other hand, provides the user with information about the surrounding area, including streets not on the route. Therefore, *Woolley* fails to teach at least this element of claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. Because *Woolley* does not support the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), *Woolley* also does not

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

support the rejection of dependent claims 2-4 for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Independent claim 5, for example, recites a vehicle-mounted apparatus comprising, among other things, an “outputting means for outputting the location information and the article information in combination”. *Woolley* fails to teach or suggest at least this element of claim 5.

Even assuming that the GPS in *Woolley* outputs information that corresponds to the claimed location information of the vehicle, and assuming the PDA in *Woolley* outputs information that corresponds to the claimed article information, the devices do not output the information “in combination” as recited by claim 5. Therefore *Woolley* fails to teach at least this element of claim 5.

Although of different scope, independent claims 9 and 11 recite features similar to those of claim 5. Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5, claim 10 depends from claim 9, and claim 12 depends from claim 11. *Woolley* therefore does not anticipate claims 6-12 for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 5. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 5, 2006

By: 

Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921